

## Education and Morality

HIS EMINENCE FRANCIS CARDINAL BOURNE

*Presidential address, inaugurating the triennial National Catholic Congress, London, September 13, 1929. Reprinted from the London "Catholic Times."*

THE coincidence of our triennial National Catholic Congress with the year in which we are celebrating the Century of Catholic Emancipation gives a special character to this Congress, and marks very definitely the direction which its deliberations should take.

So far this year we have for the most part been engaged in giving thanks to God; and, with the object of rendering these thanks fuller and more complete, the events of the past hundred years and the solid progress which they denote have been set forth in varying detail in services and celebrations in all parts of the country. The Bishops in their Joint Pastoral Letter issued for Lent dwelt upon the great factors of Catholic teaching which made the Christian character of the English people, and can preserve that Christian character. That teaching prevailed for a thousand years, and left so deep an impression on the mind and heart of the nation that it is only now, after nearly four hundred years of maimed and gradually weakening teaching of those fundamental truths, that we definitely witness its practical disappearance.

The emergence from obscurity and compulsory silence, the slowly growing influence of the Catholic Church, her regained power of raising her voice and enunciating more loudly the sacred principles for which she ever stands, have come, we trust, in time to save England from the disappearance of these vital truths without which Christian nations ultimately perish.

Tonight I would wish to turn your thoughts to certain great problems confronting the country as a whole; to ask you to realize how serious the future really is if these problems be not met and solved, and how in the traditional

Faith of Christianity as taught by the Catholic Church a solution can be found.

While there is around us much vague perception of the problems in question, outside the Catholic Church there is little appreciation of their gravity, and hardly any suggestion of a real solution.

The main problems are these: the preservation of the Christian character of the mind of this country, and the safeguarding of the Christian morality of its people. In other words: are the English people to remain definitely Christian in their outlook upon life, and equally Christian in the conduct of their lives? They are, therefore, problems of education and of morality.

To both, the Catholic Church gives a clear answer and affords a plain solution. Can she, as the second hundred years of her renewed freedom begin in our country, save, renew, and perpetuate the Christianity of England?

#### CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

In the first place, is the education of England, of the people of England, really Christian today? The subject has been forced upon our attention with fresh insistence during the discussion of educational matters in recent months. The late Government showed a real desire to unite in common effort all the educational interests and forces in the country; and I trust and hope that the new Ministry, to which as representing the constituted authority of the country I wish every success, will build upon the good will already assured to such desire.

But the negotiations thus begun brought into the foreground the attitude of the non-provided and of the provided schools in the matter of the religious teaching. Lord Eustace Percy, whose untiring endeavor to promote understanding deserves universal gratitude, felt bound to bear witness to the value and even definiteness of the religious training in the Council schools. But this very witness has obliged some of us to look more closely into the matter than ever before, to revise our previously conceived judgments, and to ask ourselves whether or not we have in the past judged untruly and unjustly.

Honestly, we must declare that we judged justly in the

past, and that neither our apprehensions nor our misgivings have been removed by the tribute of praise bestowed upon the neutral religious lesson given in the publicly provided schools. What does it amount to? We are told that the Lord's Prayer and the Apostles' Creed and other prayers may be recited, and that passages of the Bible may be read, but all without comment distinctive of any definite creed. Is such instruction sufficient to make a boy or a girl really a Christian in any definite sense at all?

It must be remembered that, at the present day, the elementary schools are dealing with many hundreds of thousands of children who never receive any kind of religious teaching in their own homes, for even religiously minded parents, for the most part, leave such things to others. It is recognized that very few such children are regular attendants at a Sunday school.

#### SUNDAY SCHOOLS CANNOT SUPPLY

The idea that Sunday-school teaching can supply for the deficiencies of the day school is no longer tenable, for it has proved to be fallacious. Thus the only religious teaching which such children receive is of the character I have described. Again, I ask, is such instruction sufficient to make a boy or a girl really a Christian in any definite sense at all?

What is it to be a Christian? It is to know and believe that Jesus Christ is truly God as well as truly man; that He came into and lived in this world to teach men to know God and to know themselves, and to fulfil their duty to God and to their fellow-creatures.

Are these things, which are quite fundamental in Christianity, being definitely taught, not as mere theory or possible explanation, but as facts accepted by all Christians, with which it is their duty to bring their lives in harmony? Is the duty of prayer and dependence upon God definitely taught as the outcome of these facts of Christianity? For to make of a boy or a girl a Christian it is not enough to speak of Christ as the best and wisest and most lovable of men. He is not a Christian who does not accept Christ as God, however much he may admire, and respect, and even accept His teaching in all other things. A Moslem or a

pagan can do so equally, but does not, thereby, become a Christian.

Again, no one can sincerely or effectively teach these things unless he himself believes and accepts them. Yet there must be no tests for teachers of such things, if they be in Council schools, though they must be adequately trained and sufficiently tested in every other subject of their teaching. We are a strange, illogical race, and it is somewhat hard to see how this differentiation in tests for teachers found its way into our educational system.

Presumably, in 1870, when new methods were introduced, it was taken for granted that all teachers in the Board schools were convinced Christians who believed in, and fully accepted, the Divinity of Our Lord Jesus Christ, and would teach this doctrine definitely to their pupils. And the presumption was in most cases well founded, for the teachers of that day had been trained in colleges, the main object of which was to provide for the training in definite religion of the teachers themselves.

But these influences have grown gradually weaker, and in nearly sixty years the circumstances have completely changed: However much the teachers in Council schools may today be praised for zeal, competence, self-sacrifice, efficiency, the fact remains that parents are obliged by law to send their children to schools wherein it is forbidden to give those parents any guarantee that their children will be taught that Jesus Christ is truly and really God, or that the teachers themselves accept that bed-rock doctrine of Christianity.

Logically and inevitably, such a state of things must ultimately lead to a non-Christian England, unless the trend be stemmed and eventually turned back by a re-assertion of the traditional Christian Faith which the Catholic Church gave to our forefathers.

#### WHAT THE "REFORMATION" LEFT

It is manifest that a situation now exists which was not foreseen or intended in 1870—a situation which urgently demands a close revision of the policy which has created it. When in the sixteenth century many Englishmen abandoned their centuries-old allegiance to the Apostolic

See, they gave up with it belief in a Divinely safeguarded Revelation, and gradually they had to relax their hold even on a Divinely given Revelation.

Faith lost its old significance, and is today replaced by human opinion without guarantee of any certainty. They relinquished also their belief in the abiding presence of our Divine Lord in the Blessed Sacrament, and in that honor to the Virgin Mother which has ever been the protection of faith in the Divinity of her Son Our Saviour.

But, while they, most unhappily for themselves and for our country, let go their hold on these Divine truths, they did conserve and cherish other most important parts of the hereditary faith of England. They clung to belief in God, to trust in His providence, to acceptance of and resignation to His will, to the duty of prayer, both privately and in public worship, to a personal love of Jesus Christ recognized as Our Lord and God, and to prayerful reading and meditation of God's Holy Word.

Thus, though it be in fragmentary form, they saved for England some part of the Christian character which had been so deeply imprinted upon her by the continuous unbroken teaching and influence of the Catholic Church.

Even if these things be incomplete, and without the logical connection which a full faith alone can give, they are still precious, and their disappearance from the life of the nation would be a very grievous loss. Are they not now in actual danger of disappearing? Are we not in sight of their gradually approaching loss?

It is evident to all who reflect that these things cannot be retained unless they be taught to the growing generation by word and example.

Where is this teaching to be found? Not, certainly, in very many homes wherein they are wholly forgotten. Not in the churches or chapels, for vast multitudes never enter their doors. Where then, but in the schools? They are now the only all-pervading influence in the land.

But such definite teaching as I have set forth is by law forbidden in the publicly provided elementary schools of this country. Is not England, then, in real danger of losing her Christian character which radically depends upon her acceptance of Jesus Christ as her Divine Lord and Saviour?

It is for this reason, and not solely in the interests of

pagan can do so equally, but does not, thereby, become a Christian.

Again, no one can sincerely or effectively teach these things unless he himself believes and accepts them. Yet there must be no tests for teachers of such things, if they be in Council schools, though they must be adequately trained and sufficiently tested in every other subject of their teaching. We are a strange, illogical race, and it is somewhat hard to see how this differentiation in tests for teachers found its way into our educational system.

Presumably, in 1870, when new methods were introduced, it was taken for granted that all teachers in the Board schools were convinced Christians who believed in, and fully accepted, the Divinity of Our Lord Jesus Christ, and would teach this doctrine definitely to their pupils. And the presumption was in most cases well founded, for the teachers of that day had been trained in colleges, the main object of which was to provide for the training in definite religion of the teachers themselves.

But these influences have grown gradually weaker, and in nearly sixty years the circumstances have completely changed. However much the teachers in Council schools may today be praised for zeal, competence, self-sacrifice, efficiency, the fact remains that parents are obliged by law to send their children to schools wherein it is forbidden to give those parents any guarantee that their children will be taught that Jesus Christ is truly and really God, or that the teachers themselves accept that bed-rock doctrine of Christianity.

Logically and inevitably, such a state of things must ultimately lead to a non-Christian England, unless the trend be stemmed and eventually turned back by a re-assertion of the traditional Christian Faith which the Catholic Church gave to our forefathers.

#### WHAT THE "REFORMATION" LEFT

It is manifest that a situation now exists which was not foreseen or intended in 1870—a situation which urgently demands a close revision of the policy which has created it. When in the sixteenth century many Englishmen abandoned their centuries-old allegiance to the Apostolic

See, they gave up with it belief in a Divinely safeguarded Revelation, and gradually they had to relax their hold even on a Divinely given Revelation.

Faith lost its old significance, and is today replaced by human opinion without guarantee of any certainty. They relinquished also their belief in the abiding presence of our Divine Lord in the Blessed Sacrament, and in that honor to the Virgin Mother which has ever been the protection of faith in the Divinity of her Son Our Saviour.

But, while they, most unhappily for themselves and for our country, let go their hold on these Divine truths, they did conserve and cherish other most important parts of the hereditary faith of England. They clung to belief in God, to trust in His providence, to acceptance of and resignation to His will, to the duty of prayer, both privately and in public worship, to a personal love of Jesus Christ recognized as Our Lord and God, and to prayerful reading and meditation of God's Holy Word.

Thus, though it be in fragmentary form, they saved for England some part of the Christian character which had been so deeply imprinted upon her by the continuous unbroken teaching and influence of the Catholic Church.

Even if these things be incomplete, and without the logical connection which a full faith alone can give, they are still precious, and their disappearance from the life of the nation would be a very grievous loss. Are they not now in actual danger of disappearing? Are we not in sight of their gradually approaching loss?

It is evident to all who reflect that these things cannot be retained unless they be taught to the growing generation by word and example.

Where is this teaching to be found? Not, certainly, in very many homes wherein they are wholly forgotten. Not in the churches or chapels, for vast multitudes never enter their doors. Where then, but in the schools? They are now the only all-pervading influence in the land.

But such definite teaching as I have set forth is by law forbidden in the publicly provided elementary schools of this country. Is not England, then, in real danger of losing her Christian character which radically depends upon her acceptance of Jesus Christ as her Divine Lord and Saviour?

It is for this reason, and not solely in the interests of

our own Catholic schools, that I plead most earnestly for a complete revision of the policy initiated in 1870, and for such a re-settlement as I ventured to outline at our last Congress, at Salford in 1926—a solution which all admit to be absolutely fair and just to all classes and creeds.

I am prepared to admit, though I have not examined the matter closely and I have no means of doing so, that many parents are satisfied with the religious instruction given in the provided schools, either because they desire nothing more, or because they find means of supplementing it elsewhere.

But I feel quite convinced that there must be very large numbers of parents, now inarticulate and unorganized for the most part, who have not abandoned their vague hold on those fragments of religious teaching which they have retained, and who desire and would welcome for their children a more complete and definite Christian education in the elementary schools; a teaching to be imparted by those who hold and practise the teaching which they in turn deliver to younger minds. For such parents and their children no provision is at present made.

There are others, neither inarticulate nor unorganized, who by their self-sacrifice in providing schools at their own cost, and by proclaiming on every occasion their conscientious convictions, have demonstrated their insistence on a definite religious education for their children. But these parents, whether Catholic, or of the Church of England, or Nonconformists, have since 1870 been placed at great disadvantage, and have paid a very heavy price for their insistence.

#### NEED OF EQUITABLE SETTLEMENT

Is it not time, after nearly sixty years of strife, discussion, and discrimination, that we should arrive at a final settlement equitable to all concerned, and conservative of the Christian character of the teaching of this country?

I ask this Government, as I asked its immediate predecessor, to give encouragement to all forms of sound educational endeavor, not to attempt to divorce them from the religious influences which are so often their source and inspiration, but to render all equally available to parents,

who are surely entitled to exercise in regard to them their individual liberty of choice.

Grant to all such parents, who from the inadequacy of wage or salary cannot themselves pay for the elementary education of their children, a State scholarship for each child as it arrives at school age; and let such scholarship be tenable at any recognized efficient school. Then, undoubtedly, there would come into existence, through the organized efforts of the now directly interested parents, schools of the different types required, built with or without, as the case may be, the cooperation of the religious communions to which the parents belong.

There would be schools with no more definite religious education than that which is given in the provided schools. There would be schools in which would be very clearly taught and practised the more definitely Christian doctrine which I detailed above as the general inheritance accepted by England from the old universal Christendom. There would be Catholic schools as there always have been and always will be. There would be schools of the Church of England. There would be Nonconformist schools, probably in larger numbers than in recent years.

Throughout, the parents of the children would be the ultimately determining factor. But all would be treated alike, and no undue burden would be thrown upon those who attach more importance to religious than to secular teaching. Poorer parents would be assimilated more closely to those of larger means in that there would be given back to them some kind of liberty in their choice of a school for their children.

The religious differences unnecessarily hampering—unnecessarily hampering, remember—educational development would cease to exist, for they would be eliminated.

And the rights of the State to safeguard and ensure the civic education of its citizens would remain unimpaired in its control of the due training of teachers and of the sufficiency of school buildings, for the State scholarships given to parents would be of value to cover all charges, whether for capital or maintenance, which the provision of the school entails.

I make my plea, as I have said, not for our own schools solely—or, may I say it, even principally—but for all the

schools of the country, in order that thereby the Christian character of England and her people may not gradually perish, but may be preserved, strengthened and developed until it grows into full acceptance of the whole Revelation of Jesus Christ Our Lord.

#### CHRISTIAN MORALITY

We may turn now to the other no less urgent problem, which, in the interest of the nation itself and of its future well-being, must be faced and met—the safeguarding of the Christian tradition of moral conduct, which is in grave peril from the uncertain hold on principle which we see on every side.

This Catholic and, therefore, Christian tradition is plain and definite. The Creator has for the preservation and perpetuation of human life upon this earth bestowed upon men certain instincts, cravings, and passions. All these must be used according to the reason which is part of our nature, and for the purpose for which they were bestowed, and not outside that purpose, still less against it.

But these instincts and passions are not under the immediate control of our reason, nor do they submit immediately or with full subjection to the ruling of our will. Their power and influence may be restrained and must be held in leash, or they will overwhelm the will and make us subject to themselves, and not to reason and conscience. As they manifest themselves in early life, while the strength of manhood and womanhood is yet undeveloped, and the will is weak, and the imagination vivid and realistic, every wise precaution must be taken to prevent them asserting themselves too much, and perverting their use to some end outside that for which they were given to us; for instance, for mere self-gratification.

Christian teaching has always proclaimed that, in the satisfaction of these instincts, certain things are absolutely forbidden by the law, which we call the natural law, because it is imprinted on our conscience as a very part of our nature, so that our nature, when not perverted and misled, is in instant revolt against them. Even the non-Christian and the pagan are aware of this natural result.

In the legitimate use of these instincts in the state of marriage the positive law of God has intervened; for,

whether by the Revelation of Christ Our Lord, or in the legitimate exercise of the authority of the Church, marriage has been restricted to the permanent indissoluble union of one man with one woman in certain prescribed conditions, without which the union would be invalid.

But the Church, knowing that certain unions would probably be unhappy or harmful to the race, has by her authority, which she holds to be Divinely given, forbidden such unions under pain of nullity, so that they cannot be validly contracted by her children. While thus obliged to declare null and void such unions if it be judicially proved that they were entered into contrary to her laws, she all the time proclaims her complete powerlessness to break a union which has been validly contracted according to those laws.

The principle is always the same: that these strong instincts must be controlled, that they are given for one only purpose, and that their use and satisfaction outside that purpose, for self-gratification, is unlawful and constitutes grievous sin in the sight of God.

#### PRECAUTIONS FOR SELF-CONTROL

Knowing how sense and passion may be awakened and rendered well-nigh uncontrollable when full rein is given to the imagination; remembering, too, the teaching of her Master that there may be grievous sin when in thought or desire the will adheres deliberately to what is evil, even though there be no external act, she insists on precautions being taken against all incentives to sensual passion in dress, in literature, in art, and the like.

Such precautions will vary in accordance with time and circumstance. The Christian Church can never forget her Founder's terrifying denunciation of those who give scandal to the little ones who believe in Him.

Such is the undoubted tradition of Christianity. Is it an exaggeration to say that it is now being flouted on every side, and that the very principle on which it rests is derided, and a directly contrary principle is openly, though sometimes only implicitly, asserted?

What in reality and in ultimate analysis is the ground of the demand for extended facilities for divorces, for birth prevention, and the like? Simply that the instincts and passions of which we have been speaking are entitled to self-

gratification, though, in seeking it, they contravene the Christian or even the natural law. For the self-control which Christianity has always taught, and which Paganism upholds to a certain extent, the right to self-gratification is substituted. If it cannot be obtained within the limits of the law of Christ, that law must be set aside! If natural reason forbids it, then that reason must be hushed and put to sleep.

Analyze all the motives that are set forth by earnest, well-meaning and—I would fain believe—conscientious men; the hard cases which they so pathetically quote, with a view to the extension of facilities for divorce. They all come to the same thing—the cry of instinct for self-gratification, and the proclaiming of the impossibility of self-control.

Soo, too, with the apostles of birth prevention in a still more dangerous degree. And apparently they do not see that the principles which underlie all their assertions and appeals lead logically and inevitably to the condoning and justification of every form of self-indulgence within or without the marriage state.

What appeal to self-restraint can the promoters of divorce honestly make to the millions who of necessity must live a single life? How can those who deliberately interfere with the natural processes of life preach purity to the women whom they themselves have taught to avoid these consequences, which once reinforced the hesitating voice of a vacillating conscience? For, alas! their evil books are read and studied by the young, whom matrimony has never joined.

If self-gratification can justify such practices, where can the line be drawn? May not such self-gratification be sought with equal justification in every form of self-indulgence, for the old distinctions between the natural and the unnatural can by such pleaders no longer be logically maintained. They have done their best to obliterate them.

#### CLEAR MORAL PRINCIPLES

I do not think that the people of this country are awake as yet to the inevitable consequences of the doctrines to which I have alluded. It may be remembered how, just before the General Election, the Catholic Young Men's Society was holding its annual meeting in the Midlands, and

speeches were made and resolutions were passed referring to these very grave questions.

I received a letter at that time deprecating such allusions, and the writer quite evidently regarded birth prevention and the like as of far less importance than the possibility of the return of a Labor Government, describing them as "really only side issues."

The same want of clear moral perception is to be found constantly in our newspapers when discussion arises as to immoral books, plays, and fashions. The real issue between moral self-control and immoral self-gratification is forgotten and ignored, and toleration is claimed for conduct which leaves this issue wholly out of account.

Yet it is a very plain one to all those who accept the Christian law and tradition of morality. It may, I think, be fairly summed up as follows: The writers of books, the painters of pictures, the actors on the stage or for the screen, the women by the fashion of their dress, who render self-control more difficult for the average normal man or woman, and who thereby make the natural craving for self-gratification more imperious than it would otherwise be, are doing moral evil, and are committing sin in the sight of God.

No silly prating about the necessity of elucidating problems, or that "to the pure all things are pure," or that the claims of art must be satisfied, which we frequently hear, can change the moral law or alter the fundamental facts of human nature. No one can deny that around us there are many things uncensored and unchecked, which are rendering the practice of continence, whether in the married or unmarried, far more difficult than it ought naturally to be for the normal average man and woman, while the allurement to vicious self-indulgence is proportionately increased.

#### MARRIAGE AND MOTHERHOOD

This same craving for self-gratification at all costs is degrading the holy state of matrimony and bringing into contempt that motherhood which should be the glory of the woman wed to man. On this point I would let those speak who can do so with greater knowledge and experience, and, therefore, greater weight, than I could claim for any words of my own. I quote from a very thoughtful statement which I have received.

There are many who do not realize how greatly the difficulties of parents, and especially of mothers, have increased under modern conditions. Catholic mothers who live among women of modern habits often find their natural duties harder because of the contrast in the way of life. They see those about them who are without children, free to travel, to play athletic games, to join in a feverish social life; while they may have to let their children take a lower place in the social scale and see their husbands overwhelmed by family cares. And to them, of course, the housing difficulty is trebled by their young family.

While the technically poor have immeasurably the greatest suffering in many respects, those who are badly off in the middle class have to pay heavily for medical and nursing benefits, and, in consequence, find it a terrible struggle first to rear and then to educate their children.

I am not supposing that any of us would really believe the childless woman to be happier, although her life may be easier. But to face the trials of a full home life it is absolutely necessary for the mother to keep her ideals untarnished and to conquer the creeping sense of discouragement born of fatigue. It is depressing to feel all about you not only the absence of sympathy but positive disapproval.

Parents are often taunted if they have large families—sometimes even by Catholics—as if they were self-indulgent in the matter. They are told that it is selfish to give birth to many children if they cannot afford to bring them up “healthy, wealthy,” and, therefore, “wise.” It is also suggested that it is cruel to those children who are already in the world to injure their prospects by adding to their number.

Parents know that the common comment of their neighbors when family difficulties are acute will be: “After all, it’s their own fault to have all those children.”

Nothing but God’s grace, I know, can keep a true sense of the values of a Christian life, but I have often wondered if we could not do more as a community to increase a corporate atmosphere of high ideals of sympathy, of admiration, so that the Catholic mother should be fully conscious of her status in the Church, of her great mission, and should have every possible help from the clergy and from her fellow-Catholics.

So often books and sermons on marriage are occupied chiefly with divorce and birth control; and very little more is said to a young mother than that she must *not* practice birth control and must *not* be divorced! The *shall nots* at this time of danger are so much louder than the beatitudes.

Can we hope for a great crusade of the ideal of parenthood and the assertion of the value of the gift of life against a pessimism that only dwells on pain and difficulty?

We all need to have brought home to us the greatness of the shadow of the Fatherhood of God and the glorious unity of parents, as of Christ and the Church. There has been a move in the right direction in the education given to girls in some of our leading Catholic convent schools. It has been realized that, if the children are taught to think of married life as their probable state, as a great

mission full of possibilities—a vocation in every sense of the word—half the battle will be gained. On the other hand, it is no fitting preparation for a Christian life in the modern world to let them look upon marriage as an inferior state adopted by those who cannot bring themselves to be generous with God.

There are many evils very common today, such as the overstressing of the physical side of marriage, and the general objectionable discussion so frequent among young people concerning nullity or birth control, which can only be countered by a great recall to the ideals of marriage and the reverence and reticence that would follow. The young will respond to the attraction of the heroic ideal if it is put before them in all its glory; and many, both men and women, have to be heroic or be lost to the Church in this critical time.

If the atmosphere of paganism is full of discouragement and produces a dangerous amount of depression, the atmosphere of sympathy in the great work of a Catholic mother, which I can recollect in the past, is a most real and practical help.

Many feel that what is now called a great "gesture" of encouragement, almost the indication that a mother with children is a privileged person, would greatly help our young mothers in all classes. It may be said that that would only be of use to the good ones, but even the good ones are exposed to the poison that is in the air. Also, a solid, cheerful bloc of proud Catholic mothers will draw others to them, and will help the weak-kneed and feeble.

In Catholic countries the mother of the family has such an acknowledged position that she can impose her ideals with more self-confidence. However truly excellent are public Catholic feminine activities, they are less valuable than home duties; but the women who do public work get far greater commendation, admiration, and encouragement. It is quite interesting to go about the country attending meetings, and very dull to stick at home and fancy yourselves becoming old before your time.

It would be to our own advantage as a community to give a higher status to the mothers among us. There is an unfortunate tendency in modern society to over-value the opinions of intellectual men and women who know how to express their ideas, and to lose the value of the wisdom born of the experience of life. We may easily forget that it is to the wisdom, the courage, and the good will of Catholic parents that we must look to avert the appalling dangers to our country, of the practice of birth control, and of the rapidly increasing evils of divorce.

This then, as it appears to me, is the special mission of the Catholic Church in this country in the second century of recovered freedom which is opening out before us, namely, to strengthen and uphold that Christianity which is based upon and rooted in belief in the Divinity of Jesus Christ Our Lord; and to maintain the tradition of Christian moral life.

In these things the Church has never wavered. She has

ever proclaimed her faith; she has never failed to declare the moral code which governs the relations of men and women according to the law of the Creator. It is true that her own children, those who call themselves Catholics and are accepted by her as such, sometimes set that law at naught.

Occasionally we have the scandal of writers and of others, who claim the name of Catholic, but debase that name by the character of their writings. But their conscience is not at rest; they are conscious that they are doing evil, and that pardon can be obtained only by acknowledgment of guilt, and by suitable reparation where definite scandal has been given. They can claim neither sanction nor condonation from the Church to whose membership they allege that they adhere.

But we may thank God that, whatever their shortcomings, their failings, or their sins may be, the vast majority of Catholics are sound and staunch in their intellectual hold on the great principles which I have been endeavoring to enumerate. They can be, they ought to be—by God's help they will be—a really healing element in the nation.

By the silent example of their lives, by the influence of their words in the intimacy of private conversation, by their speech on those public occasions when they are able to set forth even indirectly the faith which inspires them, and the principles which animate them; by their unflinching support of the public authorities in their endeavors to restrain incentives to lawless self-gratification; above all, by their prayers and by their own personal union with their Divine Master, they have it in their power to render to this England, which we all love so dearly, a service the extent of which no one can today forecast and the value of which God alone can tell.

# A Pastoral on Higher Education

RT. REV. JOSEPH SCHREMBs, D.D.

*Reprinted from the Cleveland "Universe Bulletin," December 20, 1929.*

DURING the week of January 22 to 31, the Jesuit Fathers are going to make their appeal to the general public for financial assistance in building up a new and greater John Carroll University.

During the past forty-three years they have given noble and whole-hearted service in the cause of higher education and have trained men of fine moral character and undoubted culture, who today are an honor to the Church and to the State.

The urgent need for larger facilities and a new group of buildings requires no demonstration. Anyone at all acquainted with their present location and with the buildings which house the present college, will say without a moment's hesitation, that it is time indeed that John Carroll University found a new home adequate in every way to its mission and its need. The phenomenal growth of Cleveland, too, and of the northeastern section of Ohio, which it will serve through its dormitory buildings, makes this need even more apparent.

John Carroll University, or St. Ignatius College, as it used to be called in the olden days, is the only Catholic institution of its kind in the entire Diocese of Cleveland. It served the diocese well in the past, and it will continue to do so in the future.

With a vision to the future I am engaged even now with the authorities of John Carroll in perfecting a plan of unifying and strengthening all our higher schools of learning through the establishment of a Catholic Educational Corporation of the Diocese of Cleleveland under the general leadership of John Carroll University. When this plan is completed, it will mark indeed a tremendous advance in the history of education, in our diocese, of which we may well be proud.

These reasons compel our generous and whole-hearted cooperation with the coming campaign. Each day makes it clearer to me that the Catholics of this diocese are on trial, as it were, before the community at large, and we must be

able to show that we have gone to the extreme limit of generosity for an institution that has done so much for the Church. The responsibility of the Bishop, the clergy and the Faithful is clearly outlined in the new Code of Canon Law.

Canon 1379, Paragraph 1, states explicitly that it is the duty of the Bishops to see that secondary, as well as elementary schools be established in the diocese. Paragraph 3 reminds Catholics that they are to give according to their means for the building and maintenance of such schools.

The Canon Law itself makes no distinction as to the auspices under which such schools are conducted. It does fix, however, definitely and clearly our joint obligation—Bishop, clergy and Faithful—effectively to see to it that such schools of higher learning shall be provided and maintained.

While it is true that the John Carroll University is operated by the Jesuits, it is clearly a public Catholic institution of higher learning in whose benefits we all share, and for the maintenance of which my conscience as Bishop, and the conscience of every priest and every Catholic layman, is burdened.

A few years ago the pastors of the Akron Deanery of this diocese, moved by a most laudable zeal for the Catholic cause, assumed voluntarily a most generous contribution from each parish to provide a Catholic hospital for the city and Deanery of Akron. The amounts pledged over a period of ten years varied all the way from \$5,000 to \$80,000, according to the means of the respective parishes. I heartily approved this plan which made a Catholic hospital in Akron possible. Words fail me in expressing my deep appreciation of this splendid, and I dare say, unique generosity on the part of the pastors and people of the Akron Deanery.

A Catholic university for the entire diocese is of even greater importance for intellectual leadership in Church and State than a hospital for Catholic life. I, therefore, welcome and most cordially approve the plan submitted by a Committee of Priests of this diocese in the subjoined letter.

With all my authority as Bishop, I urge upon you my devoted clergy and generous laity the fullest and the most whole-hearted cooperation with this plan. With the vision

of the future before us, we cannot allow this campaign to fail. The failure would not be that of the Jesuits, but of the Catholics of the Diocese of Cleveland, who, I repeat, are on trial in this campaign.

Your generous contributions will be an eloquent testimony indeed to present and future generations of the generosity of priests and people, and of their keen understanding and sound valuation of the far-reaching blessings of such an institution of learning as John Carroll University.

I avail myself with great pleasure of this opportunity to thank the faithful of those parishes who generously contributed to the Parmadale Memorial Chapel to commemorate the Golden Jubilee of Our Holy Father, and the momentous Lateran Pact which marks the settlement of the Roman Question, and incidentally my own Ruby Jubilee.

In view of the urgent necessity of a university chapel for the new John Carroll institution, I felt inspired to devote your generous gift to the building of the Memorial Chapel at the future university grounds, and while the Chapel Fund must of necessity remain intact, I feel it is only fair and just that parish contributions to that fund may be credited to the proposed parish contributions for John Carroll.

I wish also to express to priests and people my sincere and cordial appreciation for their hearty cooperation with every appeal for the welfare of the diocese, and I pray God to strengthen you in your struggles and trials, and to bless you as He only can with abundance of grace and consolation.

Very devotedly yours in Christ,

+ JOSEPH SCHREMBS,  
*Bishop of Cleveland.*

## The Pope of Catholic Action

R. A. M.

*Reprinted from the "N. C. W. C. Review," January, 1930*

POPE PIUS XI'S words on Catholic Action have been brought together in a large volume by Monsignor Cavagna, ecclesiastical assistant of the Italian Catholic Young Women's Society. The volume is in Italian and is published by the Central Committee for the Priestly Jubilee of Pius XI.

Everyone who has read something of the Encyclicals, letters and addresses of the Holy Father and the decrees of the Sacred Congregations has known of the interest of Pius XI in Catholic Action. The present volume is impressive and overwhelming evidence. Five hundred and thirty-nine large and closely printed pages are filled with his direct words, with newspaper summaries of addresses he delivered, with telegrams sent in his name by Cardinal Gasparri, Secretary of State, and with decrees of Congregations.

The chronological index by itself is startling proof. From February, 1922, to the closing dates in this book in September, 1929, only in three months did he fail to speak publicly of Catholic Action, explaining it, urging it, developing its content. Again and again he turns to it. There is little doubt that, along with his settlement of the Roman question, he will go down in history as the great Pope of Catholic Action.

Over and over again he insists on action. "When we prepare a missionary," he writes to a Catholic society in Belgium, "we think particularly of his inward training, but if the missionary should keep to himself this interior life, the world would not be converted. He must preach, he must perform good works, he must act exteriorly."

"So, too, with Catholic Action. Its first consideration should be to make good Christians. But the Christian, once trained, must spend outside of himself the life that he has received. He ought to carry everywhere this treasure of Christianity and make it live in every field of life, in the family and in public life, not excluding politics. For what We wish is that Christ rule on earth as He rules in Heaven and that His Kingdom over the world become effective."

He is speaking to the leaders of Catholic organizations in Rome. "What is Catholic Action? It is action and as such it includes every effort of life; it is to live and to do." And then he goes on to speak of how all our living and doing is to be penetrated with Catholicism.

Catholic Action, he repeats often, is "the participation of the laity in the hierarchy of the apostolate." Just as among the angels there is a hierarchy, that is to say, an order of ascending functions and nearness to God, so too in the apostolate on earth, in the communion of saints on earth, there is hierarchy and order among the kinds of work

to be done. Catholic Action is the part of the laity in this apostolate of Bishops, priests and people working together for the coming of the Kingdom of God in the hearts of men, in their actions and in their institutions.

Like the training of the missionary, Catholic Action looks to personal perfection and the Pope writes to the Archbishop of Breslau that "this is, indeed its first and highest purpose." But it looks, as well, to the externalization of the interior life, to the showing forth of the life of the spirit in everything done, both in personal and private acts and in the public action of whole societies and governments. Catholic Action is as broad as life. It is "spreading, defending and applying" our faith and morality "in individual, family and civil life." It is, as he said at another time, "the cooperation of the laity in spreading and strengthening the Kingdom of Christ the King among individuals, among families and throughout society."

Catholic Action is therefore not confined to Catholic organizations, which are themselves called "Catholic Action" in several countries of Europe when they are unified in forms similar to the National Catholic Welfare Conference. Catholic organizations are rather the spear-head of several of the functions of Catholic Action. They are besides a training ground in Catholic faith and morals both for the work of the organizations themselves and for those parts of life which stand separate from the work of Catholic organizations.

He is speaking to the Italian Catholic Young Men's Association. He is telling them that all of life is the sphere of their Catholicity. "To reach this Catholic solution of the problems of life, preparation is needed so as to bring together the whole program of Catholic teaching, so as to let its light shine in all corners of life, so as to make its efficacy felt in all directions." He commends study clubs for intellectual preparation and lay retreats for spiritual preparation.

But the organizations are acting organizations. He is speaking of "the importance, the extension and the need of this kind of apostolate, of this sharing of lay people in the proper mission of the Church." He says of organized Catholic Action that it is "an executing activity in the practical order," to distinguish it from the teaching function of the Church. These organizations are to deal with all sorts of

matters saving and excluding politics; they are to work on the spiritual and heavenly plane and not the political plane. But he makes here and elsewhere a distinction between partisan politics and some of the subjects with which political parties deal.

"If," he adds, "by the necessary connection of matters, it [organized Catholic Action] must go down to the economic and social field, touching even political subjects, it does so only because of supernatural interests and the moral and religious welfare of individuals and peoples." Yet over and over again he admonishes organized Catholic Action to stand apart from partisan politics.

To a group that had come on a pilgrimage to him, he speaks of the apostolate of prayer which all may follow even when they may not join in the apostolate of work and he tells them that next to the Our Father no other prayer is so direct as that Christ Himself uttered: "Send workers into Thy vineyard." He speaks to another group of the apostolate of good example. To another he speaks of Catholic Action at one's daily work. He speaks of Catholic Action in the family circle. He speaks of Catholic Action as furnishing the guiding lines of conduct in our occupations; he lists half a dozen to make his thought more specific. He speaks to journalists and tells them of the training in Catholic Action and the impetus to Catholic Action which they can give. He speaks of Catholic Action in international relations. He speaks of it in terms of general education. He speaks of it to catechists.

To him Catholic Action is a means to the realization of his motto: "The Peace of Christ in the Kingdom of Christ." It is a means of making life holy and (as he often urges) of working for the coming of the Kingdom just as we pray for it when we say: "Thy Kingdom come." Personal sanctity, prayer and sacrifice he urges at every step; but he lets few chances pass without an emphasis upon living exteriorly one's grace of God, one's sacrifices and one's prayers.